

RECEIVED
25 1919

540 Colborne St., London, Canada,
March 21/19.

Dr. Robert E. Speer,
Philadelphia.

Dear sir,

I am sending you the enclosed clipping from the "London Free Press," not in any desire to interfere in a personal quarrel, but merely in order that you may have first hand information, because I am a stickler for fair play and hate to see a person attacked in his absence, especially by so contemptible a character as Bishop Fallow.

Yours truly,
Wm R. Quinn.

RECEIVED

MAR 26 1919

Mr. Speer

Mr. R. E. Speer,

New York.

Dear Mr. Speer—

I am enclosing a clipping which speaks for itself. This controversy has been going on, for some weeks I believe. The paper has considerable circulation in Western Ontario. I saw it stated some time ago that since Bishop Fallon took his office—that is to say (if I recollect rightly) non-Catholics had entered the Church in his diocese. I thought I would bring this letter in. Advise to your attention and if you wish to reply to him, you will see his own statement. Am a layman myself—a Presbyterian elder. Yours gratefully
R. H. McDonald Box 65

R. H. McDonald

Ailsa Craig, Ont.

Mar. 24/19

Adm. Rec. Mar. 19



Dear Sir

Remember your paper ^{and} the number has not an opinion which
appeared in the columns of March 22 and ⁱⁿ the New Paper of March 22
and June 1, 1919 in which a number ^{was} abstracted as made about
you. My ^{own} side the paper & country then, ^{on you.}

Your comment to, "Your opinions are — perhaps genuine."
The address and publication of the letter from Oct. in 1909 I tried to
date copying and to identify who I had heard. I expect
in the order as publication is received I should do to be
the man printed out and now want it. ^{collections from} in the location of ^{rest}
how many copies of parts from the who have the name a real
the ^{publications} ^{else} ^{is} ⁱⁿ ^{you} ^{do}

"Your ... of ... ^{has} ^{been} ⁱⁿ ^{the} ^{paper} ^{of} ^{St. Louis}." ^I ^{am}
number a cited in ^{of} ^{your} ^{of} ^{public} ^{at} ^{the} ^{top} ^{of} ^{St. Louis}.

The author from the ^{of} ^{the} ^{paper} ^{of} ^{St. Louis} ^{of} ^{the} ^{paper} ^{of} ^{St. Louis} ^{of} ^{the} ^{paper} ^{of} ^{St. Louis}

St. Louis. I ^{was} ⁱⁿ ^{the} ^{paper} ^{of} ^{St. Louis} ^{of} ^{the} ^{paper} ^{of} ^{St. Louis} ^{of} ^{the} ^{paper} ^{of} ^{St. Louis}

a 'washed and in column, a cross panel'. I was never
so informed. ^{of} ^{the} ^{paper} ^{of} ^{St. Louis} ^{of} ^{the} ^{paper} ^{of} ^{St. Louis} ^{of} ^{the} ^{paper} ^{of} ^{St. Louis}

Caracas, El Guabonuco, Dec. 7, 1908. The letter on real discovery of
the time. I have never heard of it being discovered since. I have
repeatedly & repeatedly of Caracas and just that they have never
heard of its discovery. When was it the discovery discovered?

4. ~~In the ^{copy} original copy of the class this, I paid for
the document in a spirit of ~~kindness~~ in "on Apr. 27, 1910"~~

of the class this. I did not pay for the original copy which
I gave her to the class this in ~~kindness~~. I did not pay for it in
Rebulet. ~~In the ^{copy} original copy of the class this, I paid for~~ ~~the document in a spirit of~~ ~~kindness~~ in "on Apr. 27, 1910"

Just paid for this being. Then paid her the unacknowledged appearance
of the problem for the employees
of the ~~factory~~ ~~which~~ ~~was~~ ~~used~~ ~~in~~ ~~various~~ ~~books~~ ~~and~~ ~~magazines~~
many

for the press, namely Journal "New Questions to Caracas (1900)

— Rebulet (1909) (D. G. Rebulet p. 165). The Department of
comparisons between the ~~values~~ and
was referred to this ~~copy~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~copy~~ ~~later~~

which is authentic in its origin of ^{March 17, 1898} ~~later~~ ~~from~~ ~~you~~

consequent of "Memories of its colony — Rebulet"

This is not true. ^{reference} This ~~reference~~ ~~to~~ ~~the~~ ~~matter~~ ~~was~~ ~~of~~ ~~and~~ ~~by~~

before and ^{the} ~~the~~ ~~basis~~ ~~of~~ ~~our~~ ~~contribution~~ ~~of~~ ~~their~~ ~~reputation~~.

5. "The fact to be kept in mind is that ~~you~~ ~~was~~ ~~found~~ ~~at~~
— ~~was~~ ~~found~~ ~~at~~ ~~all~~ ~~any~~ ~~time~~ ~~in~~ ~~the~~ ~~past~~ ~~and~~ ~~there~~ ~~are~~ ~~no~~ ~~more~~ ~~reputations~~ ~~now~~

He do I need to deal at all with the uncertainty and ambiguity
instructions in the above ^{me} statements. It is safe enough to
of that not as a condition in your complete ^{letter} ~~statement~~ ~~with~~
~~report~~ ~~me~~ ~~in~~ ~~line~~ which refers to me in few from
even a subtitle.

RECEIVED

APR 4 1919

Mr. Speer

R. M. Stevenson
First Congregational C

Watford, Ontario, Canada

REV. R. M. STEVENSON, F.R.G.S.

MINISTER

Rev. Robert E. Speer, D.D.
New York.

Dear Dr. Speer:

You may have somewhat forgotten me, but a few years ago about our mutual interest in South America you sent me a copy of your book on that subject. I am now sending you an article which appeared in yesterday's paper in Ontario; I think you ought to know something of the discussion that has been going on for some weeks in that paper. The Rector of St. Paul's Cathedral, (London, Ont) and Bishop of the Anglican Catholic leader in London). If you feel led to take the matter up, please many of your true friends, but just do as you think best. I thought it my duty to let you know what was going on.

Yours very

R. M.

Ailsa Craig. April 3/19
out. Can.

Mr. R. E. Spear,
New York,

Dear Sir:—

I am enclosing two
further clippings from the
London Advertiser, re the
Fallon-Lucken controversy.

Yours Respectfully
R. H. McDonald
Box 65.

R H McDonald

Ailsa Craig. 004-
Apr 2 1st 19.

Mr. R. E. Spear,
New York,

Dear Mr Spear -

Enclosed you will
find Bishop Fallis reply to
your letter, from Saturdays
London Advertiser.

Yours fraternally
R. H. McDonald
Pof 65.

P. H. McDonald

RECEIVED

MAY 2 1919

Mr. Speer

Ailsa Craig Oak,
Apr. 29/19

Mr. R. E. Speer,
New York.

Dear Mr. Speer:-

Am enclosing
clipping from the London
Free Press - the other London
daily, with echoes of the
controversy. It appears
that it was also being
taken up in this paper
also. Yours Respectfully
R. H. McDonald
Box 65

Dear Sir:

Readers of "The Advertiser" and of "The Free Press" have sent me copies of letters which appeared in "The Advertiser" of March 22nd and in "The Free Press" of March 21st and April 1st, 1919, in which a number of misstatements are made about myself. May I ask the privilege of correcting some of these explicitly, one by one?

1. Your correspondent says: "Speer's speciality was the villification of the Catholics of the whole South American continent - no small undertaking; and, incidentally the collection of funds from the gullible victims of his falsehoods - an easier and more profitable operation." In some addresses and publications after returning from South America in 1909 I tried to state carefully and truthfully what I had learned. If any statement in these addresses or publications is incorrect I shall be glad to have the error pointed out and shall correct it. As to the collection of funds I have never collected any funds from those who heard these addresses or read these publications or from any one else.

2. Your correspondent says, "Speer offered as proofs of his slanders two forged documents, one a bogus encyclical attributed to Pope Leo XIII, and the other a counterfeit pastoral of the Archbishop of Santiago." I have never mentioned or cited in any way a pastoral of the Archbishop of Santiago.

3. In another place your correspondent says I quoted a pastoral of the Archbishop of Venezuela. I presume he means "the Archbishop of Caracas & Venezuela." A pastoral letter of this Archbishop, Juan ^uBaptista Castro, I did quote. "On October 18, 1910", your correspondent says, I "was informed that the Archbishop of Venezuela had styled his alleged pastoral a wicked and vile calumny, a coarse fraud." I was never so informed.

This pastoral was published in full in a leading newspaper of Caracas, "El Constitucional," December 7, 1908. The letter was not disavowed at the time. I have never heard of its being disavowed since. I have inquired of residents of Caracas and find that they have never heard of its disavowal. When and where did the Archbishop disavow it and style it "a wicked and vile calumny, a coarse fraud?"

4. Your correspondent says, "On April 27, 1910, the Rev. Robert E. Speer delivered a

lecture before a missionary convention in Cincinnati, on 'Our Duty to Our Benighted Brethren of South America.' This lecture had been previously delivered in Rochester, N.Y. On both occasions the Rev. Mr. Speer repeated his slanders against Catholics of the South American continent, and quoted as his justification therefor a pastoral letter of the Archbishop of Venezuela, and an Encyclical of Pope Leo XIII, to the clergy of Chile." I am not "the Rev. Mr. Speer". I am a layman. I never delivered an address on this subject. I did not quote from the alleged Encyclical of Pope Leo to the clergy of Chile in Cincinnati. I did quote from it in an address in Rochester, believing it to be authentic and having adequate grounds for this belief. These grounds were the uncontradicted appearance of the quotation from the Encyclical in various books and magazines for ten years, namely Young's "From Cape Horn to Panama" (1900), Beach's "Geography and Atlas of Protestant Missions" (1901), "Protestant Missions in South America" (1900), Clark's "A Continent of Opportunity" (1907), and Neely's "South America, Its Missionary Problems" (1909). "The Independent" referred to this correspondence between the Vatican and Chile editorially in its issue of March 17, 1898. Your correspondent says, "Meanwhile the vile calumny had been given wide publicity by Dr. Beach, a professor in Yale University, and by Dr. Ward, editor of the New York Independent." This is not true. Their references to the matter were made long before and they knew of no contradiction of their representations.

5. Your correspondent says, "The point to be kept in mind is that Speer was found out, and that he did not announce the discovery himself. The whole correspondence was published by the Rev. Father Martin, of Cleveland, who, after following Speer relentlessly for more than two years, finally forced him to admit that the documents in question were forgeries." These are all misstatements. The Archbishop of Venezuela's pastoral is still unrefuted. The instant the alleged Papal Encyclical was called in question I withdrew all quotations from it. All references to it were cut out of the published reports of the speech in Rochester. I myself began at once a search for the origin of the document. The first printed mention I could find was in Young's book.

Through the publishers of that book I learned that the alleged Encyclical had appeared in a Chilean newspaper, "La Lei," October 24, 1887. A friend in Santiago, Chile, followed up the matter there and at length discovered the author. I at once published all the facts. Father Martin's entirely courteous correspondence did not begin until after I had instituted the search for the facts in the case and ^{it} had nothing to do either with prompting that search or with publishing the results.

6. Your correspondent says, "With a delicate consideration for the forger, Speer did not disclose his name: 'At his request I keep his name secret.' He even went the length of intensifying his offense and further stultifying himself, by offering the testimony of the undisclosed forger, in a final effort to substantiate his calumnies: 'The author of the letter' (that is the forger), 'claims that the statements are all true, even to-day.' It is impossible to fittingly qualify such conduct." What will your readers think when they know that not one word in the two quotations in this statement which are attributed to me is mine? In putting these words in my mouth your correspondent states what is absolutely untrue.

There are other misstatements in these letters, but it is not necessary now to deal further with them. Nor do I need to deal at all with the unworthy and untrue insinuations in the communications. It is enough to say that in your correspondent's letters not one sentence which refers to me is free from error or untruth. ^{I do not think of your correspondent as an "opponent" but as} In making these corrections I have sought to follow the precept which your correspondent quotes from Dean Stanley: "Let us never impute to our opponents intentions which they themselves disclaim, nor fasten upon them opprobrious names, which they themselves repudiate." Has your correspondent in ^{his} these letters followed this precept which he commends?

Dear Sir:

Readers of "The Advertiser" and of "The Free Press" have sent me copies of letters which appeared in "The Advertiser" of March 22nd and in "The Free Press" of March 21st and April 1st, 1919, in which a number of misstatements are made about myself. May I ask the privilege of correcting some of these explicitly, one by one.

1. Your correspondent says: "Speer's speciality was the villification of the Catholics of the whole South American continent - no small undertaking; and, incidentally the collection of funds from the gullible victims of his falsehoods - an easier and more profitable operation." In some addresses and publications after returning from South America in 1909 I tried to state carefully and truthfully what I had learned. If any statement in these addresses or publications is incorrect I shall be glad to have the error pointed out and shall correct it. As to the collection of funds I have never collected any funds from those who heard these addresses or read these publications or from any one else.

2. Your correspondent says, "Speer offered as proofs of his slanders two forged documents, one a bogus encyclical attributed to Pope Leo XIII, and the other a counterfeit pastoral of the Archbishop of Santiago." I have never mentioned or cited in any way a pastoral of the Archbishop of Santiago.

3. In another place your correspondent says I quoted a pastoral of the Archbishop of Venezuela. I presume he means "the Archbishop of Caracas & Venezuela." A pastoral letter of this Archbishop, Juan Bautista Castro, I did quote. "On October 16, 1910", your correspondent says, I "was informed that the Archbishop of Venezuela had styled his alleged pastoral a wicked and vile calumny, a coarse fraud." I was never so informed.

This pastoral was published in full in a leading newspaper of Caracas, "El Constitucional," December 7, 1908. The letter was not disavowed at the time. I have never heard of its being disavowed since. I have inquired of residents of Caracas and find that they have never heard of its disavowal. When and where did the Archbishop disavow it and style it "a wicked and vile calumny, a coarse fraud?"

4. Your correspondent says, "On April 27, 1910, the Rev. Robert E. Speer delivered a

lecture before a missionary convention in Cincinnati, on 'Our Duty to Our ^{Benighted} Brethren of South America.' This lecture had been previously delivered in Rochester, N.Y. On both occasions the Rev. Mr. Speer repeated his slanders against Catholics of the South American continent, and quoted as his justification therefor a pastoral letter of the Archbishop of Venezuela, and an Encyclical of Pope Leo XIII, to the clergy of Chile." I am not "the Rev. Mr. Speer". I am a layman. I never delivered an address on this subject. I did not quote from the alleged Encyclical of Pope Leo to the clergy of Chile in Cincinnati. I did quote from it in an address in Rochester, believing it to be authentic and having adequate grounds for this belief. These grounds were the uncontradicted appearance of the quotation from the Encyclical in various books and magazines for ten years, namely Young's "From Cape Horn to Panama" (1900), Beach's "Geography and Atlas of Protestant Missions" (1901), "Protestant Missions in South America" (1900), Clark's "A Continent of Opportunity" (1907), and Neely's "South America, Its Missionary Problems" (1909). "The Independent" referred to this correspondence between the Vatican and Chile editorially in its issue of March 17, 1898. Your correspondent says, "Meanwhile the vile calumny had been given wide publicity by Dr. Beach, a professor in Yale University, and by Dr. Ward, editor of the New York Independent." This is not true. Their references to the matter were made long before and they knew of no contradiction of their representations.

5. Your correspondent says, "The point to be kept in mind is that Speer was found out, and that he did not announce the discovery himself. The whole correspondence was published by the Rev. Father Martin, of Cleveland, who, after following Speer relentlessly for more than two years, finally forced him to admit that the documents in question were forgeries." These are all misstatements. The Archbishop of Venezuela's pastoral is still unrefuted. The instant the alleged Papal Encyclical was called in question I withdrew all quotations from it. All references to it were cut out of the published reports of the speech in Rochester. I myself began at once a search for the origin of the document. The first printed mention I could find was in Young's book.

Through the publishers of that book I learned that the alleged Encyclical had appeared in a Chilean newspaper, "La Lei," October 24, 1887. A friend in Santiago, Chile, followed up the matter there and at length discovered the author. I at once published all the facts. Father Martin's entirely courteous correspondence did not begin until after I had instituted the search for the facts in the case and ^{d-} had nothing to do either with prompting that search or with publishing the results.

6. Your correspondent says, "With a delicate consideration for the forger, Speer did not disclose his name: 'At his request I keep his name secret.' He even went the length of intensifying his offense and further stultifying himself, by offering the testimony of the undisclosed forger in a final effort to substantiate his calumnies: 'The author of the letter' (that is the forger), 'claims that the statements are all true, even to-day.' It is impossible to fittingly qualify such conduct." What will your readers think when they know that not one word in the two quotations in this statement which are attributed to me is mine? In putting these words in my mouth your correspondent states what is absolutely untrue.

There are other misstatements in these letters, but it is not necessary nor to deal further with them. Nor do I need to deal at all with the unworthy and untrue insinuations in the communications. It is enough to say that in your correspondent's letters not one sentence which refers to me is free from error or untruth. In making these corrections I have sought to follow the precept which your correspondent quotes from Dean Stanley: "Let us never impute to our opponents intentions which they themselves disclaim, nor fasten upon them opprobrious names, which they themselves repudiate." Was your correspondent in these letters followed this precept which he commends?

Dear Sir:

Readers of "The Advertiser" and of "The Free Press" have sent me copies of letters which appeared in "The Advertiser" of March 22nd and in "The Free Press" of March 21st and April 1st, 1919, in which a number of misstatements are made about myself. May I ask the privilege of correcting some of these explicitly, one by one.

1. Your correspondent says: "Speer's speciality was the villification of the Catholics of the whole South American continent - no small undertaking; and, incidentally the collection of funds from the gullible victims of his falsehoods - an easier and more profitable operation." In some addresses and publications after returning from South America in 1909 I tried to state carefully and truthfully what I had learned. If any statement in these addresses or publications is incorrect I shall be glad to have the error pointed out and shall correct it. As to the collection of funds I have never collected any funds from those who heard these addresses or read these publications or from any one else.

2. Your correspondent says, "Speer offered as proofs of his slanders two forged documents, one a bogus encyclical attributed to Pope Leo XIII, and the other a counterfeit pastoral of the Archbishop of Santiago." I have never mentioned or cited in any way a pastoral of the Archbishop of Santiago.

3. In another place your correspondent says I quoted a pastoral of the Archbishop of Venezuela. I presume he means "the Archbishop of Caracas & Venezuela." A pastoral letter of this Archbishop, Juan Bautista Castro, I did quote. "On October 16, 1910", your correspondent says, I "was informed that the Archbishop of Venezuela had styled his alleged pastoral a wicked and vile calumny, a coarse fraud." I was never so informed.

This pastoral was published in full in a leading newspaper of Caracas, "El Constitucional," December 7, 1908. The letter was not disavowed at the time. I have never heard of its being disavowed since. I have inquired of residents of Caracas and find that they have never heard of its disavowal. When and where did the Archbishop disavow it and style it "A wicked and vile calumny, a coarse fraud?"

4. Your correspondent says, "On April 27, 1910, the Rev. Robert F. Speer delivered a

lecture before a missionary convention in Cincinnati, on 'Our Duty to Our Benighted Brethren of South America.' This lecture had been previously delivered in Rochester, N.Y. On both occasions the Rev. Mr. Speer repeated his slanders against Catholics of the South American continent, and quoted as his justification therefor a pastoral letter of the Archbishop of Venezuela, and an Encyclical of Pope Leo XIII, to the clergy of Chile." I am not "the Rev. Mr. Speer". I am a layman. I never delivered an address on this subject. I did not quote from the alleged Encyclical of Pope Leo to the clergy of Chile in Cincinnati. I did quote from it in an address in Rochester, believing it to be authentic and having adequate grounds for this belief. These grounds were the uncontradicted appearance of the quotation from the Encyclical in various books and magazines for ten years, namely Young's "From Cape Horn to Panama" (1906), Beach's "Geography and Atlas of Protestant Missions" (1901), "Protestant Missions in South America" (1900), Clark's "A Continent of Opportunity" (1907), and Neely's "South America, Its Missionary Problems" (1909). "The Independent" referred to this correspondence between the Vatican and Chile editorially in its issue of March 17, 1896. Your correspondent says, "Meanwhile the vile calumny had been given wide publicity by Dr. Beach, a professor in Yale University, and by Dr. Ward, editor of the New York Independent." This is not true. Their references to the matter were made long before and they knew of no contradiction of their representations.

5. Your correspondent says, "The point to be kept in mind is that Speer was found out, and that he did not announce the discovery himself. The whole correspondence was published by the Rev. Father Martin, of Cleveland, who, after following Speer relentlessly for more than two years, finally forced him to admit that the documents in question were forgeries." These are all misstatements. The Archbishop of Venezuela's pastoral is still unrefuted. The instant the alleged Papal Encyclical was called in question I withdrew all quotations from it. All references to it were cut out of the published reports of the speech in Rochester. I myself began at once a search for the origin of the document. The first printed mention I could find was in Young's book.

Through the publishers of that book I learned that the alleged Encyclical had appeared in a Chilean newspaper, "La Lei," October 24, 1887. A friend in Santiago, Chile, followed up the matter there and at length discovered the author. I at once published all the facts. Father Martin's entirely courteous correspondence did not begin until after I had instituted the search for the facts in the case and ^{it} had nothing to do either with prompting that search or with publishing the results.

6. Your correspondent says, "With a delicate consideration for the forger, Speer did not disclose his name: 'At his request I keep his name secret.' He even went the length of intensifying his offense and further stultifying himself, by offering the testimony of the undisclosed forger in a final effort to substantiate his calumnies: 'The author of the letter' (that is the forger), 'claims that the statements are all true, even to-day.' It is impossible to fittingly qualify such conduct." What will your readers think when they know that not one word in the two quotations in this statement which are attributed to me is mine? In putting these words in my mouth your correspondent states what is absolutely untrue.

There are other misstatements in these letters, but it is not necessary now to deal further with them. Nor do I need to deal at all with the unworthy and untrue insinuations in the communications. It is enough to say that in your correspondent's letters not one sentence which refers to me is free from error or untruth. In making these corrections I have sought to follow the precept which your correspondent quotes from Dean Stanley: "Let us never impute to our opponents intentions which they themselves disclaim, nor fasten upon them opprobrious names, which they themselves repudiate." Has your correspondent in these letters followed this precept which he commends?

Dear Sir:

Readers of "The Advertiser" and of "The Free Press" have sent me copies of letters which appeared in "The Advertiser" of March 22nd and in "The Free Press" of March 21st and April 1st, 1919, in which a number of misstatements are made about myself. May I ask the privilege of correcting some of these explicitly, one by one.

1. Your correspondent says: "Speer's speciality was the villification of the Catholics of the whole South American continent - no small undertaking; and, incidentally the collection of funds from the gullible victims of his falsehoods - an easier and more profitable operation." In some addresses and publications after returning from South America in 1909 I tried to state carefully and truthfully what I had learned. If any statement in these addresses or publications is incorrect I shall be glad to have the error pointed out and shall correct it. As to the collection of funds I have never collected any funds from those who heard these addresses or read these publications or from any one else.

2. Your correspondent says, "Speer offered as proofs of his slanders two forged documents, one a bogus encyclical attributed to Pope Leo XIII, and the other a counterfeit pastoral of the Archbishop of Santiago." I have never mentioned or cited in any way a pastoral of the Archbishop of Santiago.

3. In another place your correspondent says I quoted a pastoral of the Archbishop of Venezuela. I presume he means "the Archbishop of Caracas & Venezuela." A pastoral letter of this Archbishop, Juan Bautista Castro, I did quote. "On October 18, 1910", your correspondent says, I "was informed that the Archbishop of Venezuela had styled his alleged pastoral a wicked and vile calumny, a coarse fraud." I was never so informed.

This pastoral was published in full in a leading newspaper of Caracas, "El Constitucional," December 7, 1908. The letter was not disavowed at the time. I have never heard of its being disavowed since. I have inquired of residents of Caracas and find that they have never heard of its disavowal. When and where did the Archbishop disavow it and style it "A wicked and vile calumny, a coarse fraud?"

4. Your correspondent says, "On April 27, 1910, the Rev. Robert H. Speer delivered a

Through the publishers of that book I learned that the alleged Encyclical had appeared in a Chilean newspaper, "La Lel," October 24, 1887. A friend in Santiago, Chile, followed up the matter there and at length discovered the author. I at once published all the facts. Father Martin's entirely courteous correspondence did not begin until after I had instituted the search for the facts in the case and ^{it} had nothing to do either with prompting that search or with publishing the results.

6. Your correspondent says, "With a delicate consideration for the forger, Speer did not disclose his name: 'At his request I keep his name secret.' It even went the length of intensifying his offense and further stultifying himself, by offering the testimony of the undisclosed forger in a final effort to substantiate his column: 'The author of the letter' (that is the forger), 'claims that the statements are all true, even to-day.' It is impossible to fittingly qualify such conduct." What will your readers think when they know that not one word in the two quotations in this statement which are attributed to me is mine? In putting these words in my mouth your correspondent states what is absolutely untrue.

There are other misstatements in these letters, but it is not necessary now to deal further with them. Nor do I need to deal at all with the unworthy and untrue insinuations in the communications. It is enough to say that in your correspondent's letters not one sentence which refers to me is free from error or untruth. In making these corrections I have sought to follow the precept which your correspondent quotes from Dean Stanley: "Let us never impute to our opponents intentions which they themselves disclaim, nor fasten upon them opprobrious names, which they themselves repudiate." Has your correspondent in these letters followed this precept which he commends?

lecture before a missionary convention in Cincinnati, on 'Our Duty to Our Benighted Brethren of South America.' This lecture had been previously delivered in Rochester, N.Y. On both occasions the Rev. Mr. Speer repeated his slanders against Catholics of the South American continent, and quoted as his justification therefor a pastoral letter of the Archbishop of Venezuela, and an Encyclical of Pope Leo XIII, to the clergy of Chile." I am not "the Rev. Mr. Speer". I am a layman. I never delivered an address on this subject. I did not quote from the alleged Encyclical of Pope Leo to the clergy of Chile in Cincinnati. I did quote from it in an address in Rochester, believing it to be authentic and having adequate grounds for this belief. These grounds were the uncontradicted appearance of the quotation from the Encyclical in various books and magazines for ten years, namely Young's "From Cape Horn to Panama" (1900), Beach's "Geography and Atlas of Protestant Missions" (1901), "Protestant Missions in South America" (1900), Clark's "A Continent of Opportunity" (1907), and Neely's "South America, Its Missionary Problems" (1909). "The Independent" referred to this correspondence between the Vatican and Chile editorially in its issue of March 17, 1896. Your correspondent says, "Meanwhile the vile calumny had been given wide publicity by Dr. Beach, a professor in Yale University, and by Dr. Ward, editor of the New York Independent." This is not true. Their references to the matter were made long before and they knew of no contradiction of their representations.

5. Your correspondent says, "The point to be kept in mind is that Speer was found out, and that he did not announce the discovery himself. The whole correspondence was published by the Rev. Father Martin, of Cleveland, who, after following Speer relentlessly for more than two years, finally forced him to admit that the documents in question were forgeries." These are all misstatements. The Archbishop of Venezuela's pastoral is still unrefuted. The instant the alleged Papal Encyclical was called in question I withdrew all quotations from it. All references to it were cut out of the published reports of the speech in Rochester. I myself began at once a search for the origin of the document. The first printed mention I could find was in Young's book.



OFFICE OF
PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL

Ottawa, April 15th, 1919.

Personal &
Confidential

Dear Mr. Speer,-

I have your letter of April 10th, with enclosures.

While I had heard that Canon Tucker and Bishop Fallon were engaged in a newspaper controversy, I did not know until I received your letter that your name had been dragged into it. This I deeply regret.

I appreciate how deeply you naturally and very properly resent the language and accusations of Bishop Fallon. Judging from the character of the correspondence which you sent me, my first impression would be that for you to enter upon a newspaper correspondence would only give increased notoriety to the matter and that the Bishop would make it a point, in any case, to have the last say. My impression is the same in reference to legal proceedings. However, I will keep the documents before me for two or three days and write you further when I have had time to think the matter over. I regret that they come to me just at a time when we are rushed with the work of the Session, and I have only had time to glance over the letters.

I deeply regret that my public duties have deprived me of the privilege of meeting you and my other old friends in the Missionary Movement. I hope some day the pressure may be removed so that we may resume the associations which I for one so greatly enjoyed.

Yours faithfully,

Rev. Robert E. Speer,
Board of Foreign Missions,
Presbyterian Church,
156 - 5th Ave.,
NEW YORK.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "W. H. Howells", written in dark ink.



OFFICE OF
PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL

Confidential

Ottawa, April 16th, 1919.

Dear Mr. Speer,-

I have given further consideration to your letter of April 10th, with the enclosures, which I now return herewith.

I am of the opinion that certain statements of Bishop Fallon are libellous, particularly those underlined, but as intimated in my former letter, I should doubt the wisdom of your instituting legal proceedings. I do not think the statements will hurt you among your friends in Canada, or the cause you represent.

With warm regards, I am,

Yours faithfully,

Rev. Robert E. Speer,
Board of Foreign Missions,
Presbyterian Church,
156 - 5th Ave.,
NEW YORK.

Dictated by Mr. Rowell
but signed in his absence.